UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Talking It Over With the Britisher

By ALSON H. ROBINSON

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Part II Chapter III. By M. K. GANDHI

Impressions of Russia Today

By KIRBY PAGE

VOLUME XCVIII NUMBER 5

Chicago, October 4, 1926

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Rossiter, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—F. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
RUSSIA—Alina Huebach

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

Announcement

Part II

OF GANDHI'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

began in this magazine on

September 20th

GANDHI'S RETURN TO INDIA
HIS LAW PRACTISE
BEGINNING OF HIS PUBLIC CAREER
and
THE GREAT STORY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Subscribe Now! *Renew Now!*

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Sirs: Enclosed please find $3.00, for which
(a) Enter my subscription for one year from date, or
(b) Renew my subscription for one year from date of expiration.

Name .....

Address .....

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 67
Talking It Over with the Britisher—ALSON H. ROBINSON 69
Jottings.—J. H. H. 70
Editorial Correspondence: American Notes—SYDNEY STRONG 71
ARTICLES—
The Canticle of the Sun—*Francis of Assisi*.... 67
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part II, Chapter III—The First Case—M. K. GANDHI 73
Impressions of Russia Today—KIRBY PAGE.... 74
POETRY—
Out of My Window—KATHARINE ALLISON MACLEAN 72
Was—*Frances Holmstrom* 72
THE STUDY TABLE—
New England, 1776-1850—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 77
CORRESPONDENCE—
Senator Frazier's Resolution—SPENCER M. DE GOLIER 78
Who Will Answer?—WILLIAM MARK TAYLOR.. 78
Gandhi—and Zona Gale!—DOREMUS SCUDDER.. 78
Cheer from UNITY's Subscription Desk—
I. E. J. UNRUH
II. MARIE LOUISE MAY
III. L. M. ENGLAND
IV. MRS. J. E. RICHARDS
V. MARIANNA G. BRUBAKER
VI. JESSIE OVERHOLT
VII. MORTIMER J. COHEN..... 79
THE FIELD—
Abraham Lincoln Centre..... 79
Towards Democracy—BLANCHE WATSON..... 79

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVIII | MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1926 | NUMBER 5

THE CANTICLE OF THE SUN

(In Memoriam, St. Francis of Assisi—Died October 3, 1226)

O most high, almighty, good Lord God, to thee belong praise, glory, honor, and all blessing!

Praised be my Lord God with all his creatures, and especially our brother the sun, who brings us the day and who brings us the light; fair is he and shines with a very great splendor: O Lord, he signifies to us thee!

Praised be my Lord for our sister the moon, and for the stars, the which he has set clear and lovely in heaven.

Praised be my Lord for our brother the wind, and for air and cloud, calms, and all weather by the which thou upholdest life in all creatures.

Praised be my Lord for our sister water, who is very serviceable unto us and humble and precious and clean.

Praised be my Lord for our brother fire, through whom thou givest us light in the darkness; and he is bright and pleasant and very mighty and strong.

Praised be my Lord for our mother the earth, the which doth sustain us and keep us, and bringeth forth diverse fruits and flowers of many colors, and grass.

Praised be my Lord for all those who pardon one another for his love's sake, and who endure weakness and tribulation; blessed are they who peaceably shall endure, for thou, O Most Highest, shalt give them a crown.

Praised be my Lord for our sister, the death of the body, from which no man escapeth. Woe to him who dieth in mortal sin! Blessed are they who are found walking by thy most holy will, for the second death shall have no power to do them harm.

Praise ye and bless the Lord, and give thanks unto him and serve him with great humility.

—Francis of Assisi.

Reports from the Chicago office up to September 15th indicate that "renewals are coming in." Our special subscribers, in other words, are becoming regulars, and thus joining permanently our UNITY fellowship. Letters indicate a sustained interest in the Gandhi autobiography, and an eagerness to read the tale of South Africa, which is now beginning. In addition, many letters manifest a genuine enthusiasm for UNITY on its own merits as a magazine, and send congratulations and best wishes for its continued success. That success, of course, can come only from a *loyal, steadfast, generous, and ever-growing body of readers!* We hope that all of our new friends will stand by, and we promise our utmost endeavors to deserve their confidence and goodwill.

"Saturday, October 3, 1226, at night-fall, without pain, without struggle, he (Francis of Assisi) breathed the last sigh." So writes Paul Sabatier in his standard biography of the immortal Saint. This was just seven hundred years ago, a long time to be remembered, yet the Assisian is as fresh and beautiful a figure today as when he walked in love and joy upon the earth. In all Christian history, there is no man quite comparable to him; next only to the Nazarene himself, St. Francis stands supreme. Yet he was not a genius. He left no writing to compare with Dante's "Divine Comedy" or Petrarch's sonnets; his preaching stirred no multitudes, as did Savonarola's, even in organizing and administrative capacity he was far inferior to St. Dominic. Furthermore, his character and career were very particularly the products of his time; he could fit in nowhere except at that strange, almost grotesque period of the 12th and 13th century! But his spirit escapes all bounds of time and place and innate capacity, as his body stripped itself of all garments when first the divine summons was heard, and he becomes for all time the first among Jesus' followers. His *spirit!* there is the secret. On the one hand, St. Francis was all gaiety and charm and merriment; his "little brothers" sang aloud with joy as they tramped the countryside, and when he was among them they burst constantly into loud peals of laughter. He was a troubador who sang of holy as others of profane love. On the other hand, St. Francis was all humility and tenderness and affection and unselfish devotion. He loved everybody and everything—men in the fields, women in their homes, the little children who flocked about him, the animals who ran to him, the birds to whom he preached, the very worms which he picked from the dust that they might not be crushed. He knew wealth, social ease, military glory, orgies of the flesh, as a gay young blade, but all these he cast aside as things in the way of the heart as it sought true joy in human service. Unite, now, these two aspects of Francis' spirit, kindle them with the fire of Jesus' example, and you have the miracle of Assisi! Has Christianity ever been tried? Yes, St. Francis of Assisi tried it—and it worked!

We are surprised and disappointed to learn from two or three of our readers that they are disturbed,

even a little disgusted, by our tributes in these columns to Mrs. Anne Besant, now on a visit to this country. Are we a Theosophist, they say? No, we reply; Theosophy seems to us to be fantastic as a philosophy, superstitious as a religion. But as we can praise a Catholic—Cardinal Mercier, for example—without being a Catholic, so we should imagine we could praise a Theosophist without being a Theosophist. Do you know, we are asked again, that Mrs. Besant has opposed Gandhi's policies? We do, is our reply; but we also know that Mrs. Besant has been President of the All-India National Congress, has fought steadfastly and heroically for Indian home rule, and has paid exalted tribute to the Mahatma as "our Saint and Martyr, whose feet sanctify every house into which he enters" (see UNITY, July 19, page 322). Do you believe in Krishnamurti, is a third inquiry. To which we answer, No! We have no use for any Messiah, or Christ, or World-Spirit doctrine; we reject every idea of limited or exclusive revelation. Mrs. Besant's credulity here is regrettable; so is Bertrand Russell's teaching of free love; but we still reverence the latter as we do the former. As a matter of fact, we profoundly admire two things in human beings—great ability, and utter consecration. When these are united, as they so seldom are, in one person, we bow down in reverence before such person. Differences of opinion, of religious faith, of service and ideal, never intrude upon our obeisance. Mrs. Besant we cannot follow in many ways, but we acclaim her as one of the great and noble women of our time—one of the few supreme women of the present day—and would give her every opportunity to be heard and understood. Bernard Shaw pays tribute to "her heroic courage and energy," and declares that his "personal feeling" towards her "remains as cordial after a long period of years, during which I have hardly seen her a half a dozen times, as it was when her associations with the Fabian Society brought me into daily intercourse with her." George Lansbury speaks of her as "one of the best and bravest of women," and asserts that she "will live in the future as a great teacher of great truths." Viscount Haldane testifies that "her life has been one of high public service," and hails her proudly as "an old friend of mine." Philip Snowden proclaims that "no woman of this generation has devoted supreme gifts of oratory and intellect to great humanitarian causes with such energy and disinterestedness as Mrs. Besant." J. Ramsey Macdonald declares that after "the flints and thorns" which have come to her as a "pioneer," she is now coming "at last to well-won honor." For joining such a tribute of praise, we have no apology of any kind to offer to anybody.

If the Council of the League is not to expand into an unwieldy body and not to drift away from the original design of a round table for the Great Powers in whose hands lies the decision of world war or peace, Spain's demands will have to be rejected.

This is a statement from an editorial in the New York *Times* (September 17th), stanch defender of the League of Nations from the beginning, on the question of Spain's dispute with Geneva over the matter of a permanent seat in the Council. We ask our readers to ponder this statement from a friendly and authoritative source, and note well what it means. The position of this paper has always been that a league of nations, a democratic, representative body for the consideration and conduct of international affairs, is absolutely necessary to the peace of the world. The position of this paper has also always been that the League of Nations established at Geneva is *not* such a league. On the contrary, we have contended in season and out that the League is nothing in the world but an alliance of the Great Powers for the control of Europe in their own interests, and incidentally for the dominance and control of all smaller nations under the threat of war and conquest. In the beginning the League was even worse than this, in the sense that it was an aggregation of Allies, victorious in the Great War, for the enforcement of the infamous Versailles Treaty. Now that this Treaty has become absolutely unworkable, as injustice must always prove unworkable, Germany has been admitted to the League today as Russia will be tomorrow. This makes the alliance one of Powers instead of Victors, which is an enormous gain, as we said last week, but the essential character of the League as an alliance and not a league still remains. The League an organization for peace? Not at all! It is "a round table," says the *Times*, ". . . for the decision of *war* or peace"—war whenever necessary for aggrandizement and power, peace when nothing particular is to be gained by war. As a lover of peace, we have no interest in such a League, and see no reason why America should join it.

Two days after the publication of the *Times* editorial above referred to, there appeared in many newspapers throughout the country a syndicated article by the eminent correspondent, Mr. Frank Simons, entitled (Boston *Herald*, where we read it), "League Still Battle-Ground of Disputes in Which U. S. Has No Concern." In this article, Mr. Simons argued that the admission of Germany into the League, great step as it was, none the less revealed the real character of the League in a way to dishearten its friends and discourage their hope for its future greatness as an agency of peace. We quote some sentences from this article, carefully chosen to do no injustice to text or context:

What has actually triumphed in Geneva has been not the spirit of the League, nor the purpose of the League, but . . . "the concert of Europe."

Last March represented the desperate, if hopeless, effort on the part of the smaller nations . . . to prevent the great

powers using the League . . . to pay the costs of their own agreements.

In process of time there has grown within the League a whole system of League politics revolving about the clearage of small powers and the great. . . . They (the great powers) have steadily pursued the policy of dominating the League through the Council.

For France, Britain, or Italy, for Germany tomorrow, the League is not a sovereign body; it is an instrumentality to be manipulated to serve national interests which are at stake.

The utter, complete and for the time being final collapse of the disarmament conference, held under the auspices of the League, is perhaps clear evidence of the reality as contrasted with the appearance of League influence.

Mr. Simons gives due credit to the League of Nations for much that it has done, and clings to hope for its future. But he refuses to be deceived; and, as regards this country, would have us stand aside. He says:

In view of what has lately happened, is there a new reason for America's entrance? I cannot see it.

Rudolph Eucken, dead in Germany on September 15th last, was at the height of his fame, as a philosopher and teacher, in 1908 when he obtained world-wide recognition as a winner of the Nobel Prize. He won great personal attention, and his books a wide reading, when he visited this country in 1912 as a Harvard exchange professor. This was the time when we saw and heard and met him, and were greatly impressed by his simplicity and his occasional passion of prophetic utterance. Like so many another great and noble figure, Professor Eucken was engulfed by the seething flood of the Great War, and, in spite of much activity after the war years, never really emerged again into fame and influence. His sweeping defense of Germany's cause in 1914-18, and his furious denunciation of the Versailles Treaty, gravely aggravated his inevitably unfortunate position as the leading philosophical light of German *Kultur*. Now that time has passed, and especially now that time has brought radical revision of our ideas about the Great War, these things no longer appear so serious, and it is possible to make just judgment of Eucken's worth. He was not one of the great philosophers—he did not enter into the great succession of German thinkers. But his uncompromising spiritual idealism took on a peculiar worth and beauty in these hard, materialistic, militaristic days; and, when applied to the problem of Christianity, as in his very popular book, "Can We Still Be Christians," assumed an aspect of leadership which millions recognized and acclaimed with gratitude. Lacking the originality of James, the brilliancy of Bergson, the poetry of Santayana, the profundity and practical genius of Dewey, he yet excelled them all in a certain breadth of vision, a passion of conviction, and a serene faith in that God who is "spirit" and must be worshipped "in spirit and in truth." There are few thinkers to whom, in these mechanistic times we could turn more wisely than to Rudolph Eucken.

Talking It Over With the Britisher

My experience during the past few weeks leads me to the belief that this is not a very easy thing to do. Of course one can always pick up an argument with a ubiquitous crusader in the vicinity of Hyde Park; but that hardly gives you a fair sample of the state of the British mind. For the most part the average Britisher is disinclined to do much talking. He seems badly confused, like a man crossing a traffic laden street. But if one is patient, and doesn't try to do too much of the talking himself, he will get his reward through the working of certain instinctive reactions which sooner or later the most reserved person will betray.

For one thing you will be reminded of a fact which Americans are likely to overlook, namely that when one refers to the Britisher he means not the Englishman alone, but the Scotchman, the Welshman and the Irishman. In such classification is involved one of the great issues with which Great Britain is involved today. When you visit any of these countries, such as Scotland, for instance, you are made to realize that however much you may be within the domain of the British Empire, you are still in Scotland, and that's a very different matter from being in England. It may seem a silly sort of provincialism at first, but as one moves about through such a region as the Scotch border, breathing everywhere an atmosphere of romance and adventure immortalized by the imperishable writings of Sir Walter Scott; as he sees on every hand the marks of cruel struggle through which the Scottish Chieftains fought their way against the oppressive forces of the English, it is scarcely necessary for him to look much further for explanation or even justification of the Dominion point of view. The English realize this too.

In the most recent History of England which has yet appeared, by G. M. Trevelyan, there is a sentence in the preface which shows how close to the surface this entire issue lies. "Scottish, Irish, Welsh, and overseas Imperial history," says Mr. Trevelyan, "are treated, I trust not in all cases from too English a point of view."

A rather striking example of this tribal loyalty came to my attention one day in conversation with the clergyman of a nonconformist English Church, living in a coast town near the English Channel, from which so many of our American women have latterly emerged, dripping with fat and salt water, following a heroic effort to swim the channel. I had never thought of this clergyman as any other than an Englishman—in speech, manner of dress, general point of view and atti-

tude, it would be difficult for the average person to judge him peculiar in the slightest degree. But one day when we were talking about the coal strike he suddenly turned to me and said, "You know these Englishmen are a stupid lot. I'm a Welshman and haven't the slightest sympathy with the way they are handling this question." If you talk it over with the Scotchman or the Irishman you get much the same reaction, and one forms something of an analogy between these conflicting loyalties in Great Britain, and those which we find among those from other countries who seek the hospitality of our American life. The cross currents of our National life may be greater in number than with the British; but still the tension is there as it is here, and scarcely less easy to adjust in one case than in the other. Such a situation makes the Britisher disinclined to talk it over. He wants first to know something of the nature of your loyalty.

For another thing, the Britisher doesn't like to talk, because he has just gone through the unprecedented experience of a general strike. For twenty-one days the entire industry of a nation was at a standstill; and although the outward tangible marks are of no great seriousness, still the average Englishman doesn't seem to know quite what it was all about, nor is he certain that the conditions of settlement, whatever they may be, are such as to prevent a recurrence of the upheaval. The source of aggravation out of which this disturbance developed, namely the strike of the coal miners, still remains an open sore in the industrial and social life of the nation, with little hope of immediate settlement. Large numbers of the miners are going back to work on the old terms, but the terms and conditions are almost beyond human endurance, and I cannot see how anything constructive or permanent will result until there is a thoroughgoing reorganization of the industry; and that is the one condition to which the owners appear quite unwilling to submit. On the other hand, one is inclined to ask the question whether the method of the strike as a means of securing redress may not have passed its usefulness, and altogether ceased to be an effective weapon. It is quite obvious that labor must have some weapon for its defense and the protection of its rights; but whether the method of the strike, which in every instance is based fundamentally upon violence is any longer to be depended upon, is an open question.

Among the few Britishers in public life who are inclined to talk it over with fearlessness and sincerity perhaps one of the most conspicuous is Mr. Saklatvala, the Communist member of Parliament. The aspect of this whole issue which appears to interest him most keenly at the moment is the development of British Imperialism—the relations of the Empire to India, China, and other Asiatic countries. It is obvious enough that relations of some sort, and on a fairly extensive scale, must be cultivated with these countries; and the product of British Industry must be offered in exchange for such articles of food and raw materials as these countries may supply. This, however, is only part of the story. The other part, and what made the trouble, was that one day in Parliament Mr. Saklatvala insisted upon pointing out that the establishment of cotton mills in India and China under the conditions of cheap labor which obtain in these countries was bound sooner or later to bring this foreign labor into competition with the workmen not only of Great Britain but of the United States as well; with the consequent and inevitable lowering of the standards of living. Now that was the thing which the members of the Interparliamentary Union who represented Great Britain did not want said in the United States; and it was, presumably, for this reason that pressure was brought upon our Department of State to look upon Mr. Saklatvala as an undesirable visitor. But of course somebody is going to say that sort of thing here in this country, and perhaps under circumstances which may be quite as dramatic as from the lips of the British Communist. And I suggest that if you watch the development of public opinion here in America it will be to find that the next great misunderstanding between the United States and Britain will develop out of this Imperialistic urge with which both of them are infected.

ALSON H. ROBINSON.

Jottings

Our readers will be interested to know that our correspondent in India, whose name for obvious reasons cannot be published, is now being "sought" by the British authorities. "The Government of India," he writes, "is aroused to find out the writer, and try him for exposing this Government."

A clergyman of something more than local fame declares that 64 per cent of the young people of this country are immoral. We think he is wrong, for our investigations show that not more than 59⅞ per cent are thus immoral. Statistics in matters of this kind cannot be too exact.

It impresses and depresses me that the people who are saying that Prohibition is a failure are the ones who have failed to try it.

This is Lady Astor's reply to the question, What do you think of Prohibition? In reply to the question, What do you think of Lady Astor's answer, we would say that we think it a hit square in the bull'seye.

Christopher Morley reports (in the *Saturday Re-*

view of Literature) that the "American writers most highly esteemed by the British trade" are: Emerson Hough, Kathleen Norris, Zane Grey, Jack London, C. A. Seltzer, Grace Richmond, Hulbert Footner, Joseph Lincoln, L. M. Montgomery, B. M. Bower, Achmed Abdullah, G. W. Ogden, J. W. Schultz, Eleanor H. Porter and J. O. Curwood. It enlightens us to discover that, of these fifteen authors, we have heard of seven—less than half; and that we have read just two—Jack London and Joseph Lincoln. What an ignoramus! *What an ignoramus!!*

When Lieut. Byrd flew to the north pole, we cried, "What's in a name?" We shout the same question again, as we note that "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes" is written by Miss Loos.

Sherwood Eddy and his party have come back from Russia recommending the recognition of the Soviet Republic. President Coolidge states that this makes no impression upon *him*, but it will upon others. The day for silliness about Russia and her rulers has passed.

J. H. H.

American Notes

[Editorial Correspondence]

I

The press has been carrying this last week the information that in Australia cancer had reaped 70,000 victims during the past 17 years. . . . This is a serious problem all over the world,—the increase in cancer mortality. . . . It is pointed out that this is 10,000 more than Australia's losses during the last war. The increase is chiefly an increase in cancer of the digestive tract. In America, cancer kills about 125,000 persons annually, and this mortality is increasing at the rate of two and one-half per cent a year. My readers will be interested in what is being said about prevention. In the first place it is generally agreed among those who know most about the subject that cancer is due to unnatural conditions which civilization imposes upon us and can be prevented by a return to natural habits and diet. And here are suggestions offered by the American Society for the Control of Cancer:

1. Consult a physician if you have any continuous irritation, sores that do not heal, moles which change their shape and size, or abnormal discharges.
2. If you have broken teeth or dental plates which rub or bind, go to a dentist.
3. If you have persistent indigestion or steadily lose weight, go to a physician.
4. If you have lump in the breast, go to a physician.
5. Avoid all quacks, proprietary remedies and Indians and gypsies who make cancer diagnoses or promise cures.

The best physicians and surgeons are preaching to the people that a cultivation of natural habits in exercise and eating coupled with a large element of outing life is the best remedy. Cancer, in America, is more prevalent in the city than in the country.

II

I had a call last week from an exceedingly interesting American whose experiences root back in time before the Civil War, when the country was threatened with dissolution. It is Rev. Theodore C. Walker. He was born in 1839 and in 1860 was a young man in Oberlin College, when he volunteered to go out and fight for the North. At that time 3,000,000 Negroes were slaves. He was in a town that was a leading station on the "Under-ground Railroad" by which fleeing slaves were carried northward into free Canada. It was the day when the Republican Party was getting under way with its slogans of Free Speech, Free Press, Free Soil. Other things also were at that time begun. And some of these were started at this same town of Oberlin. New ideas seemed to be bursting for expression. Oberlin College was the first in all the world to adopt co-education. Also, the first to receive Negroes as students in the same class rooms with whites. And, a little later, it was this same Oberlin that gave birth to the Anti-Saloon League, the organization, which more than any other agency nailed the lid of the coffin down upon the American saloon, and brought about Prohibition. "There was a time," said Mr. Walker, "when Oberlin teachers, going to neighboring towns were sure to be insulted, if not stoned and mobbed." I was impressed by the fact that young Walker joined the "24th Ohio *Volunteers*." That was the day when conscription had not been discovered for English-speaking people. It would have been unbearable, unthinkable. It has been an occasion of disappointment and astonishment that Americans swallowed conscription under Wilson, with hardly a murmur. I could not have believed that a people could have sunk so quickly into the bondage of conscripts. Those were stirring times—when Lincoln came to the front—when in the background God was getting ready to free the slaves, the days of the "irrepressible conflict." There were men and women in the North who refused to wear cotton goods or socks, in order to avoid any appearance of slavery. The days when the workmen of the English Midlands showed their love for human freedom by endorsing the side of the North, after the North came out with the proclamation freeing the blacks, even though the cotton mills of England were linked with the South economically. . . . In talking with Mr. Walker, I realized that what good men desire patiently often comes suddenly, and in unexpected ways. In the span of one man's life, slavery in America had been abolished, prohibition enacted, women advanced to a position of equality with men and universal free education secured. There certainly is progress.

III

If I were asked to lead a stranger to one of the most significant objects in an American city, I should take him to a modern laundry. Of course, it would be a big one, for it will cover a block or more. In

the course of some remarks that I had the pleasure of making recently before some laundry workers, I referred to the modern laundry as being a cathedral of cleanliness, suggested by the truth that cleanliness is said to be next to godliness. The functions of a modern laundry are like those which a cathedral is supposed to perform. A modern laundry—when it is remembered what goes into its doors, that later appears clean, starched and respectable—does its work even better than the work done by a cathedral. The evolution of the wash basin has been carried farther in America than in any other part of the world, and the laundry is the last word in cleanliness. Family washing has gone along the same road that family worship has taken; it has gone to the "cathedral." Perhaps as significant as the modern laundry is the modern milk factory, which, while not exactly making milk, takes the milk from the cow to the home by treating it and dressing it up in such a way, that the barnyard is completely eliminated. The modern milk wagon, distributing its bottles of cream, ordinary milk, buttermilk—all sizes, direct to the homes is one of the best evidences of a bit of spiritual-materialism, that, in an American city, one could point to. . . . I would make the guess that there are as many bath tubs, milk bottles and laundries in America as in all the rest of the world put together. When I recall seeing women doing the family washing in the Seine and seeing goats in Cairo being driven from door to door to be milked as each house might demand, and then think of modern laundries and milk factories supplying cleanliness and health, I am led to believe that some forms of materialism have distinct spiritual aspects.

IV

One of the strange things in America's development is the way life has attained uniformity. Americans have never been socialistic, in fact they have rather been anti-socialistic. It has been known as the land of the "individual." Yet, in spite of, or because of, her individualism life has been noticed as being uniform. Standardization has been attained in America as nowhere else,—in education, in production, in mercantile business, in social customs. How do you account for it? I find it difficult. Here is a people of over a hundred million, widely scattered, from two score of different national roots, and proclaiming themselves as individualists, and yet producing in many respects remarkable uniformity, so much so as to be objectionable to visitors. Here is an industrial world, insisting on individualism in its management, rather swiftly arriving at uniformity and standardization and a moderate degree of socialization. The success of America is almost an argument for anarchism as the road to socialism. At any rate, one may raise the question whether American industry will not be socialized before England's or Russia's? Take the "chain-stores" that result in the practical elimination of the middle man—so objectional to the socialist—they have spread all over the land, in almost a night, and they are multiplying. It must be admitted that American capitalism, without intending it, has introduced a certain amount of socialization into American life, and through giving higher wages than elsewhere has distributed quite a share of production. Nearly every workman here owns an automobile. One can see thousands and tens of thousands of the workers, with their families, thronging the roads on a holiday or Sunday or at evening after supper.

Last week, I fell in with a longshoreman as he was on his way to work. He told me that he received 90 cents an hour, with a $1.25 an hour for over-time. He received $78 the week before and $2,200 for the past year. When he spoke of his job, he said "yob," thus showing that he was a newcomer, also that newcomers do not crowd down wages. I confess that the economic condition of America is puzzling. It is strongly individualistic and capitalistic, and yet it reveals so much that is socialistic. I keep asking, will this every-man-an-automobile condition last? Or does the strong individualism of each tend to demand and secure certain social rights and pleasures, with the ability to get them? And I ask, if Americans can secure so much standardization and socialization and general prosperity while working an individualistic principle, what wonders might they not perform if they went forth armed with a social plan?

SYDNEY STRONG.

Out of My Window

Out of my window
All I can see
Is a green tangle,
Tree close to tree,
With a few rifts
Where the light comes through,
Heart-stirring glimpses
Of gold and blue.
I rise from my bed
As the sun comes up,
I drink the morning
As from a cup.
Rifts widen, rose
And gold revealing,
I greet the sun
At my window kneeling.
The leaves hang close
Where the branches lean,
When the sun shines through
They are living green,
Luminous, bright
Beyond belief
Is the gold-green glory
Of sun-shot leaf.
And the heart of me
Bows to adore,
Lord, Lord, I ask,
What is heaven for?

KATHARINE ALLISON MACLEAN.

Was

They sat in spring twilight, and talked of me;
Tired and hushed, with heavy grieving spent.
"He was," they sighed, and all their longing leant
Against the blind door of finality.

"He was. . . . He was. . . . ." White petals made a mist
Delicate, round them, the wisteria vine
That said my name because I loved it, mine,
Dropped blue upon them from its gnarly fist.

"He was," they wept. I had been hers and his,
And was not now. Weeping, they could not hear
Lips of my hyacinths, unclosing near,
That spoke with knowledge, and that said, "He is."

They could not feel me, tho they felt the dew,
Nor see my feet, that bended not the grass.
"He was. . . our own". . . They did not hear me pass,
But the wisteria and the rose-vine knew.

—*Frances Holmstrom.*

Contemporary Verse.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1926)

PART II—CHAPTER III

The First Case

Whilst in Bombay, I began, on the one hand, my study of Indian law, and on the other, my experiments in dietetics in which Virchand Gandhi, a friend, joined me. My brother, for his part, was trying his best to get briefs for me.

The study of Indian codes was a tedious business. The Civil Procedure Code I could in no way get on with. Not so, however, with the Evidence Act. Virchand Gandhi was reading for the Solicitor's Examination and would tell me all sorts of stories about Barristers and Vakils.

Sir Pherozeshah's ability (he would say), lies in his profound knowledge of the Codes. He has the Evidence Act by heart and knows all the cases on the thirty-second section. Budrudin Tyebji's wonderful power of argument inspires the judges with awe.

The stories of stalwarts such as these would unnerve me.

It is not unusual (he would add), for a barrister to vegetate for five or seven years. That's why I have signed the articles for solicitorship. You should count yourself lucky if you can paddle your own canoe in three years' time.

Expenses were mounting up every month. To have a barrister's board outside the house, whilst still preparing for the barrister's profession inside, was a thing to which I could not reconcile myself. Hence, I could not give an undivided attention to my studies. I developed some liking for the Evidence Act and read Mayne's Hindu Law with deep interest, but I had not the courage to conduct a case. I was helpless beyond words, even as the bride come fresh to her father-in-law's house!

About this time, I took up the case of one Mamibai. It was a "small cause." "You will have to pay some commission to the tout," I was told. I emphatically declined.

But even that great Criminal lawyer, Mr. So and So, who makes three to four thousand a month, pays commission!

I do not need to emulate him. I should be content with Rs. 300 a month. Father did not get more.

"But those days are gone. Expenses in Bombay have gone up frightfully. You must be businesslike."

But I was adamant. I gave no commission, but got Mamibai's case all the same. It was an easy case. I charged Rs. 30 for my fees. The case was not likely to last longer than a day.

This was my *debut* in the Small Causes Court. I appeared for the defendant and had thus to cross-examine the plaintiff's witnesses. I stood up, but my heart sank into my boots. My head was reeling and I felt as though the whole court was doing likewise. I could think of no question to ask. The judge must have laughed and the Vakils no doubt enjoyed the spectacle. But I was past seeing anything. I sat down and told the agent that I could not conduct the case, that he had better engage Patel and have the fee back from me. Mr. Patel was duly engaged for Rs. 51. To him of course the case was child's play.

I hastened from the court. I do not know whether my client won or lost her case, but I was ashamed of myself, and decided not to take up any more cases until I had courage enough to conduct them. Indeed I did not go to court again until I went to South Africa. There was no virtue in my decision. I had simply made a virtue of necessity. There would be no one so foolish as to entrust his case to me, only to lose it!

But there *was* another case in store for me at Bombay. It was a memorial to be drafted. A poor Musalman's land was confiscated in Porbunder. He approached me as the worthy son of a worthy father. His case appeared to be weak, but I consented to draft a memorial for him, the cost of printing to be borne by him. I drafted it and read it out to friends. They approved of it, and that put into me a certain amount of confidence that I was qualified enough to draft a memorial—as indeed I really was.

My business could flourish if I drafted memorials without any fees. But that would bring no grist to the mill. So I thought I might take up a teacher's job. I had studied English well enough and should have loved to have taught English to the Matriculation boys in some school. I could have thereby met part at least of the expenses. I came across an advertisement in the papers:

Wanted, an English teacher—To teach one hour daily. Salary Rs. 75.

The advertisement was from a famous high school. I applied for it. I was asked to report myself. I went there in high spirits, but when the principal found that I was not a graduate he regretfully refused me.

"But I have passed the London Matriculation with Latin as my second language?"

"True, but we want a graduate. There was no help for it. I wrung my hands in despair. My brother also felt much worried. We both came to the conclusion that it was no use spending more time in Bombay. I should settle in Rajkot where my brother, himself a petty pleader, could give me some work in the shape of drafting applications and memorials. And then as there was already a household at Rajkot, the breaking up of the one at Bombay meant a lot of saving. I liked the suggestion. My little establishment was thus brought to an end, after a stay of six months in Bombay.

I used to attend High Court daily whilst in Bombay, but I cannot say that I learnt anything there. I had not sufficient knowledge to learn much. Often I could not follow the cases and dozed off. There were others also who kept me company in this and thus lightened the load of my shame. After a time, I even lost the sense of shame, as I learnt to think that it was fashionable to doze in the High Court.

If the present generation has also its briefless

barristers like me, in Bombay, I would commend them a little practical precept about living. Although I lived in Girgaum I hardly ever took a carriage or a tramcar. I had made it a rule to walk to the High Court. It took me quite forty-five minutes and of course I invariably walked back home. I had inured myself to the heat of the sun. This walk to the court and back saved a fair amount of money, and when many of my friends in Bombay used to fall ill, I do not remember having even once had an illness. Even when I began to earn money, I kept up the practice of walking to and from the office and I am still reaping the benefits of that practice.

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai*)

Impressions of Russia Today

We have just completed a most interesting and informing trip to Russia.

From Berlin we crossed Lithuania and Latvia, entering Russia by way of Riga. We proceeded first to Moscow and then travelled far into the interior to Nishni-Novgorod and down the Volga to ancient Kazan, capital of the Tartar Republic. Here we went into the villages and observed peasant life in this region near the border of Asiatic Russia. After another period in Moscow, we visited Leningrad and then returned to England by way of Finland, Denmark and the Baltic Sea.

During the three weeks of our stay in Russia, we moved about with complete freedom and at no time felt a sense of insecurity. The reports published in the American press that Trotsky was leading an armed rebellion against the present government and that there was street fighting in Moscow and Leningrad were utterly without foundation. This is simply another of the countless instances of false propaganda against the Bolsheviks to which the American people have long been subjected. Since four members of our party spoke Russian and several others were familiar with German and French, we were able to converse freely with supporters and opponents of the present government. We talked with correspondents of American and other newspapers and were able to meet many leading officials.

Various members of our party had interviews with the following: Stalin, General Secretary of the Communist party and successor to much of Lenin's power; Chicherin, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Smidovitch, Vice-President of the Soviet Union; Rudzutak, Vice-Chairman of the Central Executive Committee and member of the Politburo; Peters, former head of the dread Cheka, instrument of the Red Terror; Pinkevitch, Acting Commissar of Education during the absence of Lunacharsky; Kviring, Chairman of the Supreme Economic Council; Smilga, Chairman of the State Planning Commission; Osinsky, Chairman of the Soviet Statistical Bureau; Waglom, acting General Secretary of the Trade Unions; Lubimoff, Chairman of Centrosoyus All-Russian Cooperative; Yurovski, Chairman of the Board of Finance; Lobocheff, Chairman of the Grain Trading Corporation; Metropolitan Benjamin, senior bishop of the Orthodox Church; Metropolitan Seraphim of Moscow; Metropolitan Sergius of Nishni-Novgorod; Father Krasnitsky of the Living Church; and various unnamed members of the old regime in Russia.

We visited factories, laboratories, stores, hospitals, rest homes, churches, libraries, kindergartens, schools, prisons, museums, art galleries and numerous other places of interest. We attended an amateur play presented by soldiers of the Red Army within the Kremlin, the ancient fortress of Moscow, and heard them sing their revolutionary songs, including the Internationale. We joined the throngs that passed silently by the embalmed body of Lenin in a simple mausoleum under the Kremlin walls. Each evening, except Saturday, his body lies in state. We counted as many as two thousand persons waiting in line, although he has been dead for two and a half years. Night after night thousands file by the departed form of this man who has become at the same time one of the most deeply adored and most bitterly hated persons of modern times. In Leningrad we visited the former Winter Palace of the Czar and the fortress of Peter and Paul, with its tombs of the Czars and historic dungeon for political prisoners. We went through the Revolutionary Museum, in which is practically depicted the struggle of a hundred years against the worst tyranny of modern times.

In no country in the world is it so difficult to discover the full truth concerning existing conditions as in Russia today. The extent of the territory, the vastness of the population, the complexity of the problems involved, the profound differences in national psychology, the ease with which one's feelings are aroused, and the brief duration of our stay, combine to make it impossible for any of us to speak with authority on the present situation in the Soviet Union. As might be anticipated, there are differing opinions among the members of our party concerning the facts. Speaking only for myself and admitting that I may be in error at some points, I would summarize certain outstanding impressions as follows:

1. My first impression is one of amazement at the magnitude of the economic and industrial achievement of the Bolsheviks during the past five years. Both in industry and in agriculture, the pre-war level of production is now being approached, if not actually equalled, and present tendencies are upward. It is impossible to speak with certainty on this point because of the incompleteness and possible inaccuracy of available statistics. The standard of living maintained by most industrial workers is probably slightly higher than under the Czar. Concerning the relative status of the peasants, who constitute approximately 85 per cent of the population, there are contrary opinions. Some authorities believe that on the average the peasants are better off economically than before the war. While all land is nominally owned by the State, more than 90 per cent of the arable area has been divided among the peasants and is actually under their control. The amount available for each family, however, is very small. The supply of livestock is also very inadequate. Very few peasants have modern farm equipment, although the government is making heroic efforts to aid them in securing tractors and other machinery. John Maynard Keynes, the eminent British economist, who

visited Russia at the end of 1925, expressed the opinion that "the real income of the Russian peasant is not much more than half what it used to be." Whether his estimate or the higher ones be accepted, it is a fact that judged by conditions in the United States, the scale of living of both industrial and agricultural workers is pitifully low.

And yet I repeat the opinion that the economic and industrial achievement of the Bolsheviks is extraordinary. To understand this statement one must keep in mind the obstacles they have had to overcome. They came into power after Russia was completely exhausted by the colossal efforts put forth in the World War and when the national economy was in a state of utter chaos and ruin. Then followed the long and disastrous period of civil war and allied intervention, when they were compelled to fight simultaneously on several fronts against Russian counter-revolutionaries and French, British, Japanese, Czech, Polish, and American troops. Then came the terrible famine of 1921, when 13,000,000 people were in danger of actual starvation. The brief period of workers' control of factories immediately after the revolution, followed by the two and a half years of Military Communism, so completely wrecked the industrial process that the whole nation was not far removed from starvation. Production fell to 15 or 18 per cent of the pre-war level. Wages dropped to an inconceivably low figure. To understand the significance of the return to practically normal production we must also keep in mind the lack of experience on the part of most of the Bolshevik leaders. Prior to the revolution most of them had been imprisoned or exiled and few of them had had extensive administrative experience, either in governmental affairs or in industry. Two million men were killed in the World War, three million persons fled as emigres after the revolution, and additional millions died in the famine and civil war. The shortage in man-power was staggering. In the face of these and other stupendous handicaps, to have increased production within five years to the approximate pre-war level, stabilized their currency and balanced their budget, constitutes a remarkable achievement. Moreover, in no country in the world are the workers so well protected by legal enactment as in Russia. A very elaborate scheme of social insurance, covering unemployment, accidents, sickness, pregnancy, and old age is in operation.

Perhaps it may prove helpful if I say a word about the structure of industry in Russia. In 1921 the New Economic Policy was instituted. This meant a radical departure from communism in the direction of State Capitalism. Private production and trading are now permitted. Much of the retail trade in Russia is in the hands of private capitalists. However, heavy industries, including transportation and most factories employing more than twenty workers, are owned and controlled by the State. The government has a monopoly of foreign trade and thus exercises great power in determining the prices paid for export grain on the one hand and imported goods on the other. Cooperative societies play an exceedingly important part in production, distribution and banking. Private banks are permitted but the government dominates and controls banking.

2. Wherever one goes in Russia there is striking evidence of the releasing of life on a vast scale. Multitudes of people who formerly were driven like dumb cattle by tyrannous government officials and grasping industrialists and landlords, now feel a new sense of freedom and possess new vitality. Whatever may be its faults and dangers, the present government of Russia is a workers' government, the proletarian are the privileged class and are naturally conscious of their increased importance and power. The deepest longing of the peasants has always been for land, and now that they have the land they are willing to endure proletarian dictatorship. A remarkable awakening is occurring in the villages. Millions of peasants have returned after very varied experiences in the army and in Allied prisons; additional millions have returned from service in the Red Army, where they received educational and vocational instruction; hundreds of thousands have returned from cities and industrial communities. The cooperative movement, both consumers and agricultural, is growing with amazing rapidity. There are now more than ten million members of consumers' cooperative societies in Russia. The peasants are rapidly coming to a realization of their power and it is certain that they will exercise more and more influence in the determination of national policies.

The Bolsheviks are making strenuous efforts to spread education, art, music and drama throughout the land. They are severely handicapped by lack of funds and their actual accomplishment thus far in primary and elementary education is not great. The school enrollment is only slightly above pre-war days and includes only one-third of the children of school age. As a rule the equipment is poor. If economic production continues to rise, however, the government will undoubtedly steadily increase its appropriations for education. The Russian talent for music is famous around the world. Never have we been more impressed and inspired than by the singing of the wonderful church choirs. Great emphasis is placed upon the arts. The priceless art collections of pre-war days have been preserved with scrupulous care and have been greatly increased by additions from many private galleries. The treasures and jewels of the royal family have likewise been carefully preserved. We were privileged to see the Crown jewels, probably the most valuable collection anywhere in the world. At a conservative estimate the various treasures now in the hands of the Soviet government are valued at far more than 500 million dollars. That these treasures have not been stolen or disposed of is a striking tribute to the integrity of those in control.

3. This leads me to refer to a third impression, namely, that the leaders of the government are for the most part men of exceptional ability, unquestioned courage and unswerving devotion to their cause. The very fact that they have maintained themselves in power for nine years and have accomplished such remarkable results in the face of terrific odds speaks volumes as to their qualifications for leadership. Practically all those in high position are revolutionaries of long standing. Most of them have been repeatedly imprisoned and exiled. For many years their activities were illegal and they were in constant danger of being apprehended and executed. Until the very eve of the revolution they had no hope whatever of actually coming into control of the government. And yet they labored on in the hope that future generations would build upon their foundations. Even now the discipline of the Communist party is exceedingly rigorous. The salary of

party members, including the highest officials of the government, is limited to 225 rubles ($112.50) per month. It is true that officials receive free rent, automobile service and other prerequisites, and that writers and authors are allowed to retain a proportion of their fees and royalties beyond the salary limit. As compared, however, with leaders in national life elsewhere, the Bolsheviks live in extreme simplicity.

4. Moral and religious conditions in Russia are such as to cause alarm for the future. The Bolsheviks are bitterly hostile to religion. This is due in part to their scientific materialism and in part to the kind of religion with which they have had contact. The Orthodox Church was under the complete control of the Czarist government and was the corrupt tool of autocracy and tyranny. The Bolsheviks are now trying to destroy the influence of religion and the church. There is complete separation of church and state. All church lands and buildings have been nationalized. About 96 per cent of church buildings have been leased to congregations and are being used for religious purposes. There is complete freedom of worship and the churches are fairly well attended. Organized religious instruction of children under 18 is a criminal offense, although parents may give religious teaching to their own children at home, and certain exceptions are made in favor of the sectarian groups which conducted classes in the catechism prior to the revolution. Priests and ministers are deprived of the right to vote or hold office. While in the past there has undoubtedly been a great deal of persecution of the priests and many have been executed on the charge of counter-revolutionary activities, so far as we could learn the number of priests imprisoned in recent months has been very small. Anti-religious propaganda is still carried on with vigor by members of the Communist party, no one of whom could enter or remain in the party if he believed in God. There can be no doubt that organized religion in Russia is meeting the most bitter opposition of modern times. There are some signs, however, that persecution is purging and purifying the church and it may be that once more the blood of the martyrs will prove to be the seed of the church.

Concerning moral conditions it is exceedingly difficult to form accurate impressions. Even before the war moral standards in Russia were very different from our own. There has always been more freedom and promiscuity in sex relations than in America. Throughout most of Europe moral standards have deteriorated in the past decade. The Communist theories of marriage and the family have undoubtedly increased sexual looseness since the revolution. Illegitimacy is not visited with legal or social penalties, although severe financial penalties are imposed upon the father. Although marriage is very easy, many couples do not take the trouble to register. Divorce may be obtained upon request by either party, regardless of the wishes of the other. Sexual crimes, however, are punished with extreme rigor. Children are being indoctrinated with atheism. What the future holds in store cannot be foretold, but I confess that I am greatly alarmed over the prospects.

5. The present government of Russia is a rigorous dictatorship by the Communist party, which now has slightly more than a million members. No opposition party is allowed. Even within the Communist party no freedom of discussion is permitted after a party decision has been reached. The slightest breach of discipline may be met by expulsion from the party, as many as 250,000 members having been expelled in a single year. There are drastic limitations upon freedom of the press and public assembly. Public criticism of or opposition to decrees of the government that is construed as counter-revolutionary activity is severely punished. Control of the government is highly centralized and the bureaucracy is all-powerful. An elaborate and effective secret service or spy system, known as the G. P. U., is maintained. Members of the former middle and upper classes are under constant surveillance, many of whom, with or without cause, are living in constant fear. The right to vote or hold office is denied to all persons who are not engaged in productive labor by hand or brain. The disfranchised group includes employers of labor for private profit, as well as priests and servants of the church.

6. The international policy of the Soviet Union includes many elements that command my admiration and other phases that make me very apprehensive. In few countries are the rights of racial minorities so well safeguarded as in the Soviet Union. We saw striking evidence of this fact when we visited the Tartar Republic and talked with its President and Prime Minister. The Union is a loose federation of many different republics and autonomous states, any one of which has the right to secede at will. So far as we could discover, there is very little racial discrimination. The Soviet government has repeatedly disavowed the imperialist ambitions of the old Czarist regime. The Red Army has been reduced to about 560,000 men, which is relatively very much smaller than the armies maintained by most other European nations.

When we come to the question of Bolshevik propaganda abroad for the purpose of inciting world revolution, we are met with contradictory evidence. The Soviet government has signed numerous treaties with other powers in which provisions against propaganda were included. And yet we know that communist propaganda and agitation is carried on by Russians in many different countries, notably in China, India, the Balkans, Germany and Great Britain. The question naturally arises as to the relationship of the Soviet government to the activities of the Communist (or Third) International. In theory the Soviet government is entirely separate from and in no sense responsible for the Comintern (Communist International). In theory the Comintern is controlled by an annual meeting of delegates from the various Communist parties of the world. In fact it is, in my opinion, controlled by the Communist party of Russia. It was founded by Russians; its chief officers are Russians; its headquarters are in Moscow; only in Russia of all the great powers are Communists in control of the government. The real seat of authority for both the Soviet Union and the Comintern is the Central Committee of the Communist party of Russia, consisting of sixty members, and the all-powerful inner group of nine members of the Politburo of the party.

The aims and methods of the Communist party of Russia are, therefore, of great significance in relation to foreign propaganda. That the Communists are fully committed to a program of world revolution cannot be denied. The methods advocated are likewise clearly known and include agitation, plotting, the violent overthrow of existing capitalist governments, the maintenance of power by proletarian dictatorship and, if

necessary, by terror. Communists pride themselves on being realists and look with contempt upon "idealists" and "sentimentalists." They believe that the end justifies the means and say that any method which aids world revolution is right and any method that hinders is wrong. This is not only their theory of revolution; wherever conditions have been ripe in one degree or another, the theory has been put into practice. The only test is one of expediency. So long as these are the tactics of the Communist party of Russia and so long as it retains control of the Soviet Union and the Comintern, it is needless to expect propaganda to cease, regardless of any promises the Soviet government may make. As a matter of fact, we were told by a high official of the British government that the clauses against propaganda in their treaty with Russia have been violated repeatedly.

The next question which comes to mind concerns the seriousness of the menace of Bolshevik propaganda. My own opinion is that so far as the United States is concerned we have little to fear from such propaganda in the near future, and that the most effective means of combatting it is not by ostracism of Russia and the legal suppression of the Communist party in our country, but by meeting idea with idea in the open light of day. Unless we refuse to deal with the excesses of our social order and unless Bolshevik ideas are inherently superior to our own, we need not fear that they will overthrow our government. As Norman Angell has pointed out in his extraordinarily stimulating book, "Must Britain Travel the Moscow Road," revolutions are not caused by radicals but by conservatives who resist necessary social changes. Even Communists maintain that they do not "advocate" revolution, but that revolution is "inevitable" because injustice is allowed to remain unremedied.

There is another factor which should be considered, namely, the division within the Communist ranks concerning tactics of the world revolution. The practical administrators of the Soviet government say that to make a success of their own efforts is more important than foreign propaganda. Men like Chicherin, Minister of Foreign Affairs, realize that propaganda is one of the chief barriers to normal relations with other nations. It is my opinion that if the United States would recognize the Soviet Union and resume diplomatic relations the effect would be to strengthen the hands of the administrators and weaken the agitators. For this and other reasons, I strongly favor such recognition. There is, of course, the possibility that increasing success on the part of the Bolshevik government would stimulate radicals in other countries to follow their example of violence and dictatorship. Personally, I regard this danger as less than the menace of ostracism and suppression.

KIRBY PAGE.

The Study Table

New England, 1776-1850

This book* is the third and final volume of Dr. Adams's remarkable study of New England history. It thus completes the story begun in his Pulitzer Prize winner, "The Founding of New England," and continued in his "Revolutionary New England." As these two earlier works were adequately reviewed in this Department at the time of their publication, and as this last volume reveals the same qualities and maintains the same high standard as its predecessors, it is not necessary to do anything more at this time than to indicate the ground covered in this book, and thus mark the place occupied in the series which it closes.

"Revolutionary New England" ended with the Declaration of Independence. "New England in the Republic" begins with a chapter on the war for independence, or rather New England's part therein. As this part was comparatively small after the evacuation of Boston and the transfer of the area of armed conflict to the middle and later to the southern states, the tale is short, and thus comes promptly to the effects of the war, economic, political and moral. In these chapters we encounter what is a characteristic feature of the book throughout—namely, an emphasis not so much upon military or even upon political affairs as upon the every-day life of the people as expressed in all the various and changing forms of social and spiritual endeavor. "We discuss politics," says the author (Preface, page VI), "in so far as he (the common man) attempted to realize his ideals in his political life, but the movement broadened steadily to embrace many other spheres of life."

The popular unrest and disturbances in New England, after the making of the peace of 1783, culminating in mob rebellion—most notably that of Shay in Massachusetts—are described carefully, and with marked sympathy for the distress and wrath of the people. This was an uprising against tyranny at home, as much as the Revolution itself was an uprising against tyranny abroad. It is interesting to note the disillusionment and defeat following upon the victory over Britain, as the same disillusionment and defeat followed upon the victory over Germany a century and a half later. War always destroys its own ends, and shackles its own champions—and is always essentially dishonest.

With the adoption of the Federal Constitution and the establishment of the national government, reaction was triumphant, just as it is today. This brings the story to "the struggle which took place between the forces of reaction and those which tended to maintain and extend the doctrines which had been preached in 1776. The leaders of the earlier period, having achieved their object in securing independence from England, endeavored to stop the revolutionary movement from proceeding farther, and thus altering the relations of classes and the structure of society in America. Such an alteration in their favor, however, was just what had been preached to the common people in the

*"New England in the Republic, 1776-1850," by James Truslow Adams, LL.D., Litt.D. Published by Little, Brown & Co.

war propaganda, and for many decades after 1783 this struggle between these two groups constitutes the main interest of our history" (Preface, page VII). Mr. Adams develops from an abundance of rich material all the various aspects of this struggle—business, politics, education, capital and labor, and the impending question of slavery.

The reactionaries "o'er-leaped" themselves, of course, at the famous Hartford Convention of 1815. At this same time came a new outlook, a shifting of issues and purposes, a changing relationship of social classes, a merging of the local scene into the national panorama. Less and less was New England able to center her life and interest in herself. A state of mind which was close to nullification and even secession in 1815, was swallowed up and lost in the growing national consciousness. The west was opening through to the coast, and New England's sons were leading the van-guard to the frontier. New England capital was launching out upon the seas, and establishing rich markets in the far east. It was an era of expansion and discovery, which changed New England overnight. But her career of leadership was not over. Quick came that amazing period of literary achievement and humanitarian endeavor, which spanned the period from Jackson to Lincoln. One of Mr. Adams's best chapters is the one in which he tells the tale of the poets and historians, the Transcendentalists and social reformers, the movements for women's rights, prison reform, care for the insane, development of education, and above all the Abolitionists whom he gloriously vindicates in the face of a generation taught to be cynical in its attitude toward this greatest and most heroic humanitarian movement in American history. If anything is neglected here it is religion, which receives scant consideration.

Mr. Adams has written a unique and memorable book. It supersedes all previous histories of New England, and becomes what it will long, and perhaps always remain the standard work upon the subject. We are glad of this, not only because of the merits of the work as a monument of historical literature, but also because of the new and we believe fundamentally sound presentation of the story. Hitherto New England history has been written, with few exceptions, from the standpoint of the old families—the aristocrats, who had no more interest in freedom in 1776 than the English Tories. Mr. Adams tells the tale from the standpoint of the people, and their struggle really to win what they had fought and died for. "The main theme of the book," says Mr. Adams, "may be considered to be the continued struggle of the common man to realize the doctrines of the Revolution in the life of the community" (Preface, page VI). Mr. Adams is thus something more than a great historian. He is a prophet of democracy, and his book a primer of the democratic ideal.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Correspondence

Senator Frazier's Resolution

Editor of UNITY:

In 1924 the Women's Peace Union drafted a resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America by the terms of which war for any purpose shall be illegal—"outlawed," so far as this government is concerned.

The resolution was "a shock," at first, even to staunch pacifists; but, such seems to be its innate sound sense and justice, that it has steadily attracted attention from earnest, thoughtful minds, until, on April 23rd, 1925, it was introduced in the U. S. Senate by Hon. Lynn J. Frazier, of North Dakota, and referred to the Judiciary Committee, in charge of Senators Gillett, Deneen and Seely, and is known as Senate Joint Resolution No. 100, which reads as follows:

"War for any purpose shall be illegal, and neither the United States nor any state, territory, association or person subject to its jurisdiction shall prepare for, declare, engage in or carry on war or other armed conflict, expedition, invasion, or undertaking, within or without the United States, nor shall any funds be raised, appropriated or expended for such purpose."

A hearing before the Judiciary Committee of Congress on the resolution is promised for the next session; and those citizens who are opposed to war, as a crime against humanity, without avail for any good purpose, and unnecessary as well as ineffectual in settling disputes among nations, are urged to write to their Senators and Congressmen, at Washington, in personal appeal for the support of this Resolution.

SPENCER M. DEGOLIER.

Bradford, Pa.

Who Will Answer?

Editor of UNITY:

I find that I cannot do without my weekly diet of UNITY since I became a special subscriber last April, and so I am sending my check for a full year's subscription beginning with October 1st.

I would like to have Mr. Holmes write a comment or more on the article on page 411, issue of August 23, 1926, on the article entitled, "Abolish the Golden Rule," by Theodore Schroeder. What ethical statement would he suggest to take the place of the Golden Rule? I am surprised that no one has written a reply to that article.

WILLIAM MARK TAYLOR.

Columbus, Ohio.

Gandhi—and Zona Gale!

Editor of UNITY:

I am moved to write by a letter which UNITY recently printed concerning the brevity of the chapters in Gandhi's story. In the mind of some of your readers this quality makes them all the more valuable. For these chapters constitute a series of life pictures, each a gem complete in itself. One has time to think each one over by itself without having the impression blurred by complexity of detail. This characteristic of Gandhi's autobiography also brings out its unique naturalness for it moves in the Indian atmosphere where there is time for leisurely thought. It helps distinguish it from our American hurly-burlyness of life. Here's hoping that you may find it possible to continue giving the story of these experiences in the way they have been revived by the author.

A couple of months ago Zona Gale asked for a new word, positive in form, with no hint of anti-ism, positing the spirit behind "the cheek, the cloak, the miles, the gift, the loan" of Jesus, an inner energy dynamic and aggressive.

How would "brotherize" fill the bill? Put it in dictionary form—"Brotherize, verb intransitive, to act as a brother, to apply in conduct the brotherly principle, to live the brotherly life; e. g., in every sphere of life Gandhi brotherizes: also verb transitive, to lead or help or cause one to act as a brother, e. g. Jesus brotherized Paul.

A clumsy word! Yes, but what more uncouth than suffragette or suffragist, which Zona Gale terms a flaming positive? It smells of cant! Our mutual friend Robert Whitaker shows us how to "cantize" any word however strong or beautiful. The only way to keep this or any

The Field

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion."

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE CHICAGO
Friday Morning Forum
10:30 A. M.

October Program

October 8—Dr. Moritz J. Bonn
The Problems of European Economic Federation (Pan-Europe)
Professor of Political Economy in Berlin. Karl Schurz Exchange Professor in University of Wisconsin during the winter of 1914-15. Recently conducted round table discussions at Institute of Politics at Williamstown, Mass. A German delegate at Peace Conference at Versailles.

October 15—Edward A. Ross
Population—The World Problem
Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin. Author, lecturer and traveler in many lands.

October 22—Joseph K. Hart
Tests of Our Intelligence
Educational Editor of "The Survey." Dr. Hart has recently returned from an extensive study of adult education in Europe.

October 29—Charles Edward Russell
Fruits of Imperialism
Journalist, author, lecturer. Has served on diplomatic mission to Russia and on Public Information Commission to Great Britain, also at one time a member of the President's Industrial Commission.

TOWARDS DEMOCRACY

Speaking of his colleague, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, James Weldon Johnson said recently, "A poet, who should be furthering the artistic development of our country and adding to the sum total of the Negro contribution thereto he needs must use up his creative power in this enforced struggle of Negroes for the fundamental human rights that are everywhere denied to them." And Mr. Johnson, too, is a poet, and knows whereof he speaks! Just what that struggle is, and how it is being carried on by men of the calibre and spirit of Dr. Du Bois and James Weldon Johnson, the Sixteenth Annual Report* of the "National Association for the Advancement of Colored People" makes clear.

There is much in this report to hearten and encourage our Negro citizens, to shame the citizens of white extraction, and to enlighten all. The record of petty discrimination against the Negro; of vicious persecution; of downright criminal brutality stands as an obvious denial of the democracy we in these United States profess and for our acceptance of which the founding fathers were responsible. Negro baiting, Negro disfranchisement, Negro segregation, Negro lynchings and burnings,—such items make up a part of the record, together with a report of the ways and means by which the N. A. A. C. P. is carrying on the fight against such action, and for the ordinary human rights of about one-tenth of the population of this country.

Some white people who have followed sympathetically the fortunes of their Negro fellow citizens during past years will find reason for a measure of optimism in the evident progress that this and past reports show; but no self-congratulation is possible, for every step of this progress has been hotly—not to say brutally—contested by the race that all too often calls itself Master, that arrogates to itself "superiority," and that today holds the reins of power. But congratulations to the Negro,—yes, and let them be hearty and sincere! Somewhere we have heard the axiom "the harder the struggle, the greater the rewards," and surely a reading of a record such as this inspires one to declare that, in the case of this particular racial group, the reward will, indeed, be great.

In the matters of publicity—without which no fight can be successfully waged—the "white press" (for so this report characterizes it) has done good service. Credit is given to but a partial list of the publications that have aided in this phase of the work, and even this is too long for reproduction here. Suffice it to say that the best papers and magazines in the country are listed. Add to this publicity, the thousands of feet of news space that the "colored press" has devoted to its racial problems, and a very valuable support has been accorded the N. A. A. C. P. in its fight for Negro freedom. Particularly has it been able to dramatize the issue of Negro segregation and give it a national significance, waking many up to the fact that in such segregation a very dangerous precedent is being established, and one that may well give pause to other national and racial groups. It is particularly heartening to find that even in the Klan-ridden city of Denver last summer, the white dailies broke all records for space hitherto accorded

*Published by the N. A. A. C. P.—69 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

---

other term from being "cantized" is to have it lived simply and honestly by earnest souls. One thing that Zona Gale demands it fills full, for it fairly bristles with spiritual energy. It connotes "a high practice, a daily magic of turning clay into gold, not in individual strength at all but by the energy which one has allowed to pour through one from another source."

Granted that the term has its obvious limitations, the mere suggestion of it may serve to stimulate other and better contributions toward the filling of this real need.

DOREMUS SCUDDER.

Geneva, Switzerland.

Cheer From Unity's Subscription Desk

I.

Editor of UNITY:

I am enclosing a check for three dollars—the subscription price for UNITY for one year. This is my renewal.

I want to say a word of commendation of your paper: I can truthfully say that this paper is the most stimulating and wholesome from the point of view of "freedom, fellowship and character in religion" that I have found anywhere. I like the man who dares to say the thing that needs to be said regardless of the possible consequences. You are giving the truth to the world as Christ, himself, did, fearlessly. My plan is to be a life-time member of the UNITY readers.

I convey herewith my personal thanks for your courage and fearlessness in giving to us such a fine weekly.

Yours for the liberation of intelligence,

E. J. UNRUH.

II

Enclosed find check for $3.00 for one year's renewal of UNITY. Indeed I would not be without it. Not that I agree with every word written in it, but I *do* believe it is the most impartial small magazine of its kind and it will always afford me great pleasure to recommend it.

Palo Alto, Cal. MARIE LOUISE MAY.

III

. . . You are getting me into a fix. I shall feel obliged to continue my short sub. The UNITY is so interesting, helpful, humanitarian. I hope your prohibition movement succeeds and will help the Province of Canada.

Yours hopefully,

United Church of Canada L. M. ENGLAND.

IV.

Some one has been so kind as to subscribe for your UNITY magazine for me, as it has been coming regularly for the past three months. I am certainly grateful to the friend.

Will you let me know when the subscription expires, so that I can renew it at once? I had never known of the magazine before this summer, though I see it was established long ago. I consider it one of the best educators of this day, and I shall do all I can to increase its circulation.

Kansas City, Mo. MRS. J. E. RICHARDS.

V.

. . . UNITY is an excellent and very interesting paper. The article against the Golden Rule rather shocked me, but that in today's issue on MacNider is one of the best things of the sort that I have ever read.

Bird-in-Hand, Pa.

MARIANNA G. BRUBAKER.

VI.

. . . We are grateful for the fine integrity and inspiration of the articles that make up UNITY.

Wooster, Ohio.

JESSIE OVERHOLT.

VII

. . . Find your paper delightfully refreshing and spiritually stimulating. MORTIMER J. COHEN.

Philadelphia.

any Negro conference, giving the most cordial editorial support to the Association's work. In view of past sins of omission and commission on the part of the press, it is gratifying thus to note the appreciation set forth in this report.

Not the least important, but obviously the least realized phase of this struggle for recognition, in which the Negro is engaged, is that which concerns the artistic and cultural progress he is making, day by day and year by year; and this report devotes a page or so (one wishes it had been more) to this highly significant and interesting record. It is coming to be understood that today the most important periodicals in the country are open,—not only to writers who would feature the Negro, but to the Negro himself. The greatest publishing houses bring out books by Negro authors; a magazine like *The Survey* can devote an entire number to Harlem, "The City Within a City"; Negro musicians and singers fill the best concert halls in the country and pack the New York Stadium, on occasion; Roland Hayes sings before Kings in Europe, and with the Boston Symphony in America; Negro artists "show" at our best art exhibits and take prizes here and abroad; London acclaims actors with black skins as of the same dispensation as Coleridge-Taylor, and Paris and Moscow open arms to Claude Mackay. All of which means that American Negro art has attained a tremendous vogue and is still going upward and forward. "This recognition of the Negro as a creative artist and a contributor to American culture," says this report, "might strike the casual observer as a sudden happening of the last two or three years; but in fact it has taken a number of years to lay the foundation for it . . ." In this development—it may be added—the N. A. A. C. P. has been one of the active and powerful influences. Of the seven outstanding books by Negro writers that have appeared in the past two years, four of them were the work of members of the executive staff of the Association; and of these, two—W. E. B. Du Bois and Jessie Fauset—are connected with *The Crisis*, which is the official organ of the Association, and which month by month gives a remarkably intriguing and colorful account of what Negroes here and elsewhere are thinking and doing and achieving. With its knowledge of facts and its courage in the presentation of them *The Crisis* is and has been a great element in the work for better conditions for the Negro. There is no idle boast,—"When *The Crisis* has thundered the truth . . . thieves have gone to jail, imposters have disappeared, colleges have reorganized, governments have stood at attention and Klans have hurried to cover."

Here is a national organization which is spending more than a hundred thousand dollars a year —apart from what is being spent by its various branches scattered all over the country—and more than three-quarters of the money so spent has been contributed by Negroes. And to what end? One of the resolutions adopted at the last National Conference makes answer: That the Negroes may achieve "the complete abolition of lynching and mob law: political freedom; industrial democracy; better education; the absolute ending of seggregation of all sorts based on race and color" . . . What an arraignment of American justice and democracy and Christianity does this statement of purpose unwittingly, albeit definitely, set forth! And how does the last paragraph of the resolution shame us!

"We believe in humanity (it reads); we believe in the social and civic equality of all men; we will fight to the bitter end every effort to separate, segregate and publicly humiliate beings of any kind because of race or color."

A certain Declaration once said something like that? What was it? And when was it?

BLANCHE WATSON.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove

Tel. Atlantic 1876

OCTOBER

Marks the possibility of real savings in Autumn and Winter wardrobes. For through the use of this Service many previously worn garments—of men, women and children—may be recovered to further usefulness and good appearance. Fine equipment, experience and skill combine towards making our cleansing so dependable.

Schumann & Co

Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 6261 ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS

3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Your health, and the health of your entire family will be benefited by a daily glass of

Bowman DAIRY COMPANY Milk!

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.